



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Frauds, Statute of—Printed Name as Sufficient Signing.—In *Pearlberg v. Levisohn*, 182 N. Y. S. 615, the Supreme Court of New York held that the printed name of the seller on his orderblanks, if adopted by him as his signature, is sufficient signing of the memorandum to comply with the statute of frauds.

The court said in part: "The memorandum does not contain any signature of the defendants, either in ink or pencil; but the printed firm name appears at the top of it, and it is contended by defendants that this is not a signing within the meaning of the statute. The statute does not specify any particular form of signing. It merely requires that the party to be charged shall have signed the memorandum. It has been held that a cross mark is a good signature (*Zacharie v. Franklin*, 12 Pet. 151, 161-162, 9 L. Ed. 1035); also initials (*Berry v. Combe*, 1 Pet. 640, 7 L. Ed. 295; *Salmon Falls Mfg. Co. v. Goddard*, 14 How. 446, 14 L. Ed. 493); even numerals, when used with the intention of constituting a signature (*Brown v. Butchers' & Drovers' Bank*, 6 Hill, 443, 41 Am. Dec. 755); and a type-written name or imprint made by a rubber stamp has the same effect (*Landeker v. Co-operative Bldg. Bank*, 71 Misc. Rep. 517, 130 N. Y. Supp. 780; *Degginger v. Martin*, 48 Wash. 1, 4, 92 Pac. 674); and this is equally true, though the typewriting or stamp impression be made by another, if the person to be charged has directed it (*Deep River National Bank's Appeal*, 73 Conn. 341, 346, 47 Atl. 675).

"These and similar cases establish the rule that any name or symbol used by a party with the intention of constituting it his signature, or which is adopted by the party as his signature, is sufficient; and from this it necessarily follows that the party's name printed on the memorandum fully satisfies the statute, if it is shown to have been adopted by him as his signature. This has been the law in England for more than a century, and has been followed quite generally in this country. *Saunderson v. Jackson*, 3 Esp. 180; *Schneider v. Norris*, 2 M. & S. 286; *Evans v. Hoare*, 1 Q. B. 593, 596; *Hucklesby v. Hook*, 82 L. T. N. S. 117; *Cohen v. Wolgel*, 107 Misc. Rep. 505, 176 N. Y. Supp. 764; *Drury v. Young*, 58 Md. 546, 553, 554, 42 Am. Rep. 343. See other cases in note, 37 L. R. A. (N. S.) 352. It has even been held that the name of a party printed on the loose cover of his order book is sufficient. *Jones Brothers v. Joyner*, 82 L. T. N. S. 768. There is nothing in conflict with this holding in *James v. Patten*, 6 N. Y. 9, 55 Am. Dec. 376, and similar cases, for they only decide that under a statute requiring the memorandum to be "subscribed" there had to be a manual signing of it at the end. But even these cases, so far as they say there must be a signature made by hand, have been seriously questioned. *Landeker v. Co-operative Bldg. Bank*, 71 Misc. Rep. 517, 130 N. Y. Supp. 780."